	Case 3:13-cv-00654-RCJ-WGC Document 25 Filed 11/05/14 Page 1 of 2	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8		
9	ALLEN S. MEREDITH, ) 3:13-cv-00654-RCJ-WGC	
10	Plaintiff, ) ORDER	
11	vs. ) re: Doc. # 24	
12	R. FLORES,	
13	Defendant. )	
14		
15	Before the court is defendant Flores' Motion to Screen Plaintiff's First Amended Complain	ıt.
16	(Doc. # 24.) <sup>1</sup>	
17	Plaintiff initially filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis and proposed complaint of	
18	November 22, 2013; however, the application to proceed in forma pauperis was missing the requisi	
19	certificate from the correctional institution verifying Plaintiff's prison account balance. (Doc. # 1, Do	
20	# 1-1.) On May 19, 2014, Plaintiff filed another application to proceed in forma pauperis, this tin	
21	including the referenced certificate, and attached an "amended complaint." (Doc. # 3, Doc. # 3-1.) The	
22	court screened the original complaint and determined that certain claims could proceed and others wou	
23	be dismissed with prejudice, yet deferred ruling on the applications to proceed in forma pauperis. (Do	
24	#8.) The court subsequently granted the applications to proceed in forma pauperis, and ordered the Cler	
25	to file the original complaint and amended complaint. (Doc. # 15.) Defendant Flores then filed a motion	on
26	requesting that the court screen the amended complaint. (Doc. # 24.)	
27		
28		
	<sup>1</sup> Refers to court's docket number.	

## Case 3:13-cv-00654-RCJ-WGC Document 25 Filed 11/05/14 Page 2 of 2

As defendant Flores acknowledges, the original complaint and "amended complaint" are virtually identical, and contain the same factual allegations. As a result, there is no reason for the court to "re-screen" the "amended complaint," as the factual allegations that gave rise to the initial screening order are also present in the "amended complaint." Therefore, defendant Flores' motion (Doc. #24) is DENIED. The claims the court permitted to proceed with respect to the original complaint (see Doc. #8) will likewise be permitted to proceed in the "amended complaint." Defendant Flores has TWENTY-ONE DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ORDER TO FILE AN ANSWER OR OTHER RESPONSIVE PLEADING. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: November 5, 2014. Willen of Poble UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE